



The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Thursday the 29th day of March 1923, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

The SECRETARY laid on the table copies of the * Proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee held on the 22nd March 1923 as well as copies of † Appropriation Report for 1921-22.

II

THE HON. THE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING THE HOLDING OF MEETING DURING EASTER HOLIDAYS.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before I begin with the proceedings, I think it will be convenient if I ask the House to reconsider the decision it arrived at yesterday. There is apparently some dissatisfaction among hon. Members over this decision. Though, of course, it is a decision which the House has already arrived at, still it is a matter for consideration whether we may not defer to-morrow's sitting. Some hon. Members require a holiday to-morrow on account of Good Friday and, after all, we might reasonably defer to their wishes."

Mr. M. SURIYANARAYANA :—" Is it not possible to adjourn the meeting to some day later than Monday ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" No. I think we had better rest to-morrow and the day after. Government will require some time to check the whole of the Bill as amended, so that, in case there are consequential amendments, they may be incorporated in the Bill before it is passed. For this purpose they may require a couple of days. So far as I am able to say, I think the Bill will have been gone through by Tuesday evening, as we have still three days including to-day in which to finish the Bill."

The House agreed to reconsider its previous decision and to refrain from sitting on Good Friday.

III

FURTHER DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR 1923-24.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before this order of the day is taken up, I think I should inform the House that I considered the question of the disposal of the point of order raised by the hon. Member, Mr. Narasimha Raju, namely, that these demands raise a question substantially identical with others on which the House had already given its decision. Hon. Members will have to see whether the issues are substantially the same. The Standing Order says that if a certain matter has been discussed and disposed of, the House shall not be asked to go over the same ground during the same session. Now, with reference to these Budget motions, while it will not be open to the Government to move for the same grant or to ask for anything that has been voted against, what happened in certain cases last year and the year before was that they asked for supplementary grants for the purpose of winding up particular departments and offices which had been voted down by the House. I think such demands may not come within the purview of the Standing

[The President]

[29th March 1923]

Order. I have looked into the past instances where the Government came forward with supplementary demands for funds. But whether the Government are justified or not in asking for supplementary funds in this particular case is a question to be decided on its merits. So far as I am concerned, the point of order which I would look into after hearing the speeches of hon. Members will be whether these demands are made during the same session and whether they are made with the intent to reopen closed questions, or whether they are meant to enable the Government to carry into effect the decisions of the House. If I am satisfied that the latter is the case, I shall allow the motions to go forward and over-rule the point of order raised by the hon. Member. We shall now take up the further demands for grants."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—
 "Sir, you were pleased to adjourn these motions to this day to enable us to examine the question of precedents of the proposition that was advanced, namely, that a demand for supplementary grants for a portion of the year was not substantially identical, in the wording of the Standing Order, with a demand for a full year. I am bound to confess that the Bengal precedent which was cited does not appear to be in point. It is true that the Bengal Council, within the space of a little more than a month, rejected a demand of 23 lakhs on account of Police and passed the same demand. What I did not realize before is the fact that there was a prorogation and a reassembling of the Council between the 17th March, on which date the demand was rejected, and 21st April on which it was passed. As regards our own Council we have a precedent for a fresh demand in order to pay the salary for March, which is payable in April, as, for instance, in the case of Assistant Commissioners of Labour. We have a precedent for paying an officer in addition to his pay a sum which he was entitled to on his services being dispensed with in lieu of notice, as in the case of the Personal Assistant to the Sanitary Engineer. We have a precedent for a grant for a specific period for winding up a department, as in the case of the Department of Land Records. We have a precedent for employing an officer on a scale of pay different to the one abolished as in the case of the Manager of the office of the Commissioner of Labour. The conclusion which I would venture to draw from these precedents is that the part is not substantially identical with the whole and that this Standing Order will not therefore apply.

"Finally, Sir, I beg to invite your attention to a passage in the Report of the Joint Committee from which I suggest that the conclusion might be drawn that there was distinct intention to permit a review of the decision, if for instance, as in one of the cases now before the House, the votes of the Council are diametrically opposite in two resolutions. I might invite the attention of the House to the fact that the special pay in respect of the seven party officers in charge of the Survey Party was put to the House and carried. But when the special pay of the eighth party officer was put before the House, 32 voted in favour of the continuance of the allowance and 33 against. The Joint Committee to which I have already referred say:

In cases where the Council alter the provision for a Transferred Subject, the Committee consider that the Governor will be justified, if so advised by his Ministers, in resubmitting the provision to the Council for a review of their former decision. But they do not apprehend that any statutory prescription to that effect is required.

"With these words I leave the matter to the House."

29th March 1923]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" May I take it that these items in Demand XXXVIII which the hon. Sir Habib-ul-lah wishes to move are all intended for the pay of these people for twelve months ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" No, Sir, only for five months—a part of the whole. That is what I beg to draw the hon. the President's attention to. I regard the part not exactly identical with the whole. Inasmuch as I now come to the House for only a period of five months I say this motion is not identical with the motion already considered."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" May I assume that the hon. Member wants pay for five months, because the Government have not made up their minds either to follow or not to follow the decision of the House ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Exactly."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" They want five months to make up their minds as to what to do in the matter ? They want to keep the decision of the House in abeyance for some time until they can decide whether they are to follow it or not ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" No, Sir, I would have been satisfied only with one month's grant, if there was the least chance of the House meeting before. It is not that the Government want to keep it in abeyance in order to make up their minds. It is perfectly possible for the Government to come to a decision within next week or within two weeks. But inasmuch as there is a decision of the House I do not wish to set that decision at naught ; I wish to give the House an opportunity to discuss the steps to be taken by the Government on their recommendation and that cannot be done until they meet again. That will be about five months later and not earlier. That is why I specifically ask for five months."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have nothing to do with the merits of the question, and if I may say so, the hon. Member is perfectly right in taking that view. So far as the point of order is concerned, it is clear that the motion is not for the purpose of carrying out the decision of the House but for the purpose of enabling the Government to consider that decision. I, therefore, think it is out of order."

DEMAND XXXIX. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—SECRETARIAT, ETC.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Mr. President, I beg to move for—

a grant of Rs. 34,950 under General Administration.

This grant consists of three items of which some difference of opinion exists as to the first, and little if any, I believe, as regards the two latter. So, perhaps, it will be convenient if I deal with them in the reverse order.

" In this order the first item is a small one of Rs. 3,400 for the continuance of the employment of the Publicity Officer and his staff until the completion of the piece of work on which he is now engaged. Hon. Members will see that we have gone further than other provinces or the Government of India in abolishing our Publicity Board. After a discussion with the Finance Committee, however, we thought it wise to carry on the staff to the end

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[29th March 1923]

of the current year and we now ask for permission to carry it on for another month and a half to complete a particular piece of work. That particular piece of work consists of the preparation of a Madras Year Book, and it is perhaps right that I should explain to the Council how we came to undertake this. The Council are aware that for many years past Government officers and others have depended for a large amount of miscellaneous information upon a '*lal khitab*' known as the *Asylum Press Almanac*, of which we used to subscribe for a large number of copies. Of late, however, this publication has fallen on evil days, and last year it was so badly put together that we were compelled to give the compilers notice that we could not continue to subscribe to it. We understood that that meant that it would cease publication, and we thought that it would be for the public benefit if the Publicity Bureau were to put together a Madras Year Book on lines which would be more useful to the public in general. I need hardly say that there was no intention of making this a regular Government publication. What we wanted to do was to get together the basis of a useful work of reference, in the hope that private enterprise would thereafter take it on. When the work was too far gone to be abandoned and a number of orders for copies and advertisements had already been booked, we learned that another firm had embarked on the publication of the *Lawrence Asylum Press Almanac*, which we thought was defunct, and they are now advertising it as the only authorized directory. I need hardly say that I am very sorry that this competition should have arisen and that we should have been only too glad to stand down if we had had any timely assurance that the *Asylum Press Almanac* was to be continued in a shape that would be useful to Government officers. As matters stand Government would not only lose what they have expended by withdrawing their year book, but I think the public would also lose what I hope will be the basis of a very useful annual publication in future years. In these circumstances we have thought it best to go on and we ask for a further grant of Rs. 3,400. The Publicity Officer believes that this will be more than covered by the sale proceeds of the book.

"To come now to the second item, namely, the Commercial Accountant, hon. Members are aware that we are anxious to get our commercial concerns put on a business basis, the present account arrangement under which the income of a concern cannot be used for immediate expenditure being such as to render proper accounting almost impossible. This is no new question and, in fact, it has been under discussion since 1915. Meanwhile the Government of India have been working on parallel lines and have employed one of the largest firms of Chartered Accountants in England to assist them. They first lent us some officers from this firm, and since September last we have had an officer trained by them engaged in taking up our commercial concerns one after another and drawing up profit and loss accounts and accounts of their assets and liabilities. He has now dealt with five of these concerns and has still a large number to attack.

"So far, since his employment under this Government, his salary has been paid through a charge levied upon the concerns audited. This is an arrangement which the departments concerned would like to see altered and at the same time one which is likely to create difficulties where, for instance, the officer is on transfer from one concern to another or on leave for a short period or advising the Government on matters connected with his work. On the whole, therefore, it seems to be best to ask the Council to agree to his employment as a whole-time officer for the space of one year, and as the

29th March 1923]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

other departments concerned are not anxious to bear his charges, it is proposed to debit them to the Finance Department. It is hoped that we may secure a contribution towards his salary from the Auditor-General, who is responsible for the auditing of the accounts, and at the same time it would not be unreasonable to charge the various concerns with the fees which would be leviable from them if they were limited companies and had to get their books audited under the Companies Act.

"I hope that in these circumstances the Council will agree to this grant which is really a provision for the continuance of an existing and a very necessary arrangement.

"I now come to the question of the Director of Office Systems, in regard to which, as there are motions for reduction on the paper, I shall be as brief as possible in these opening remarks. What I desire to say is that, much as they regret it, the Government loyally accept the decision of the Council that this office should come to an end. All that they are now asking for is a small grant to wind up the work that is actually in hand. Perhaps I may borrow again the metaphor of an hon. Member of the front Opposition Bench who opposed the original grant. He compared himself to a gardener who economized wages on the garden by neglecting to water the fruit trees which it contained. That policy being imposed upon us, we must accept it. But we have watered the trees up till now and there is rare and refreshing fruit upon them which will ripen in the next few months. I ask the Council to let us continue watering until that fruit has ripened and been gathered, after which we will do their bidding and cut down the trees.

"The question is how long this ripening will take. As to that, I hope I may be permitted to say that I left myself absolutely in the hands of the Finance Committee, who know a good deal about the work that has been done. Their suggestion was six months and I have accordingly put on the paper a motion for half the provision originally asked for.

"I have already wearied the House with a long account of the work that has been done and is being done, and I do not think the House will wish to listen again to a long catalogue of what is still in hand. But I have one here and can give the details if any hon. Member so wishes. I can assure the House that there is work in hand, the completion of which will fully occupy six months. In fact, it might easily take more if we permitted it. But I can assure them also that we are not going to permit it, that we are going to close down, and if we find that we cannot do so without leaving some branches incomplete, we shall leave those branches incomplete, only taking steps to ensure that the work is rounded off at some convenient stage and not left in a state of chaos as it will be if we abolish the whole staff with effect from next Saturday night."

MR. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—"Mr. President, Sir, I move—

For the reduction of the allotment of Rs. 34,950 for General Administration by Rs. 10,420.

"It is only the other day that this House permanently voted for the abolition of this Director of Office Systems. Even now it is a matter of doubt whether the question can be reopened to the extent of moving a supplementary grant for retaining him for six months. I really cannot understand why the hon. the Finance Member should be so solicitous of retaining this officer for another six months. This gentleman being a

[Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai]

[29th March 1923]

pensioned officer, the question of giving him notice of six months or anything of that sort does not arise. We can dispense with his services at any time without giving notice. If we have a mind to do it, we can close his office within 15 days. Once we have abolished the post, the question of keeping it open does not arise. If any attempt is made by any officer to retain his services, such officer should be held responsible by this House for the expenditure incurred, and the expenditure should be collected from him. The Finance Committee should not have the final word to say in such matters. The question should come up before the House.

"I should like to draw the attention of the House to the Finance Member's arguments about the necessity of retaining this officer.

11-30 a.m. "The hon. the Finance Member in his speech on 15th March 1923 said :

If the issue of orders would have done all that was needed, we should have saved lakhs of rupees long ago. The trouble is that it is not sufficient to issue orders. You have to see that they are carried out.

"Perhaps the Director of Office Systems should go along with a Government Order and see that it is carried out. I think that if the departments are not able to carry out the Government Orders without the help of the Director, they ought to be warned or punished if necessary for neglect of duty. I may also say that many communal resolutions have been passed by this House and Government Orders respecting them have been issued by the Government. Perhaps the Government would like to have another Director appointed to go and see that every departmental head carries out these orders (laughter). If they don't carry out the orders, bring them to book and let action be taken by the Government. The other day, my hon. friend, Mr. A. T. Palmer, drew the attention of the hon. the Finance Member to the fact that when a post of superintendent in one of the Secretariats fell vacant, it was given to a Brahman. I presume it refers to the Law Department. Here the Under Secretary is a Brahman, the Assistant Secretary is a Brahman and all the superintendents are Brahmans and when the post of a superintendent fell vacant, it was also given to a Brahman."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"May I know, Sir, whether all this is relevant to the discussion?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I myself do not quite see the relevancy of the communal Government Orders in this connexion. At present the hon. Member should confine his attention to these three items, viz., Director of Office Systems, Commercial Accountant, and Publicity Officer."

MR. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—"I object to the continuance of the Director of Office Systems. The hon. the Finance Member says that when a Government Order is published, the Director has to go and see that that Government Order is carried out. If that be the case, we want another Director to carry out the Government Orders on communal representation.

"I want to point out the way in which we are treated by the hon. the Finance Member. It is an insult to the Members of this House. We are asked to vote for six months' pay of the Director of Office Systems when we have rejected the proposal to continue him. Another point is, I cannot understand how the Members of the Committee allowed the hon. the Finance Member to bring in this proposal. I think we ought to be careful hereafter in electing the Members of the Finance Committee."

29th March 1923]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I wish to say a word as a matter of personal explanation. Apparently there has been some misunderstanding in the Finance Committee. On a particular day, when this matter was placed before us, only information as to what the Government wanted to do was placed before us, and we never thought that our opinion was asked for."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Sir, I desire to raise a point of order, viz., whether the proceedings of the Finance and other Committees can be referred to in this House, as apart from the published results."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I should like to know, Sir, what the particular statement is to which my hon. friend takes exception, so that we may know what the point of order is."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If I understand it aright, the hon. Member, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, referred to a particular phase of the proceedings of the Finance Committee. He said that on a particular day on which a certain matter was disposed of, certain things took place, and he was proceeding to tell us what they were."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"What I said was this: the hon. the Finance Member made a statement that the Finance Committee approved of this thing or itself suggested it. I was going to explain what actually took place."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Have the proceedings of the Finance Committee for that day been placed on the table of the House?"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Then, Sir, the hon. the Finance Member's reference to them will also be out of order."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Unfortunately the hon. Member did not raise that point earlier. If he had done so, he would have known whether the hon. the Finance Member was in order or not."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"My difficulty is this, Sir. You yourself, Sir, decided on a previous occasion that proceedings of Committees of this House are not confidential and may always be referred to in the House. That is the reason why I did not raise any objection when the hon. the Finance Member made the statement; and it is for you, Sir, to consider whether, after having allowed that statement to go in, it is not fair to allow me also to make my explanation."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I quite sympathise with the hon. Member in his position. I think about a year ago I did say that the House could not be shut out from a knowledge of its own proceedings. I said so because I thought the Government were bound to place the proceedings of the Committees on the table of the House. They cannot withhold these proceedings. It was to enforce that point that I said so. Since then, the Government have accepted the view and have been placing the proceedings of Committees regularly on the table of the House."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I say, Sir, that when I referred to the proceedings of the Finance Committee, I thought they had been laid on the table of the House? I have a proof of those proceedings in my hand and I have just ascertained that they have not been placed on the table. In these circumstances I must apologise for having referred to them."

[29th March 1923]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Now that the proceedings of committees are being regularly laid on the table, I think it will be convenient if hon. Members make it a practice to refer to those proceedings that have been laid on the table and to what is contained in them and not go beyond them. Otherwise, we shall be landing ourselves in endless trouble and a Member could get up and say ‘ it is true that this is the language of the Committee’s report, but I thought otherwise ’ ; the Finance Member himself said so and so and so on. Then the question will be to find out what exactly took place. My own impression is that these proceedings of Committees should not be referred to at all till they are laid on the table and they should be laid on the table very promptly. If the Government do not lay them very promptly, the House has got the means of enforcing its wishes in the matter. They can be referred to only to the extent to which they are laid on the table ; that is to say, only the facts contained in them should be referred to, and we should not go, if I may say so, beyond the four walls of those proceedings ; because, once the House proceeds to do that, I think it will get into a great deal of difficulty.”

Mr. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—“ What I submit to this House is this : The Finance Committee should not have sanctioned more than what is necessary for one month’s pay. The present Finance Committee seems to be so very agreeable to the hon. the Finance Member.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Is the hon. Member in order, Sir, in referring to the relations that obtain between the Members of the Finance Committee and the Finance Member in Committee ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Did I understand the hon. Member to say that the Members of the Finance Committee were very pliable ? ”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Very agreeable.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Yes, ‘ very agreeable ’ ; that is the term he used. I think there is no harm in saying that. It is a compliment to the hon. Member” (laughter).

Mr. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—“ I think, Sir, the Members of this House should be more careful in future in electing the Members of the Finance Committee.”

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—“ I rise to a point of order, Sir. These demands for supplementary grants are regulated by instructions Nos. 105 and 106. Instruction No. 105 says :

When money has been spent on any service for which the vote of Council is necessary during any financial year in excess of the amount granted for that service and for that year, a demand for the excess shall be presented to the Council by the Finance Member and shall be dealt with in the same way by the Council as if it were a demand for a grant.

“ Of course, that is not applicable here. Instruction No. 106 runs thus :

(1) An estimate shall be presented to the Council for a supplementary or additional grant when (i) the amount voted in the Budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes of the current year.

“ I lay emphasis on the words ‘ current year ’, because we are now dealing with a grant which is required not for the current year but for the next year. This grant may very well be moved on Monday next when we will have no trouble about this ‘ current year ’. If we discuss this item now, it will be against this rule. So, what I would suggest is that these demands, if they are to be moved at all, may be moved, to bring them within the rule, during the next year for which the expenditure is intended.”

29th March 1923]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think the word ' current ' here refers to the year for which the original estimate was framed. So, there is really nothing wrong here. It is quite all right."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I submit, Sir, these are not supplementary grants. These are further grants. This is the tenth day of the days allotted by His Excellency the Governor for the moving of further grants."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I rise to another point of order, Sir, as to whether this sum that is now asked for is only for the purpose of winding up the work. You will notice, Sir, that the money wanted is not merely for the existing establishment but also for additional establishment. The money wanted is for the officer and also a number of inspectors to serve under him together with their travelling allowance. This sum is required not only for winding up, but also for additional establishment. Further, they say that they want six months' time for winding up. They may as well say that they want eleven months and twenty-nine days for winding up and afterwards ask for provision for one day."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I may mention that when I heard the hon. the Finance Member's speech, I did feel that he was quite within his rights. From what he said, my impression was that the money was for winding up. Whether it is right or wrong, I cannot say. But I do not think I can overrule him as I did in the case of Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib with reference to the previous demand. After the speech the Finance Member had made in moving for a grant of Rs. 34,950, I felt that he was within his rights in moving for the grant. Whether in addition to his being within his rights, he is also administratively right is a different matter with which I have no concern."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, the hon. the Finance Member has told the House that the Government have decided to accept its decision on the abolition of the Director of Office Systems. Nevertheless, he asks now under this head for a grant of Rs. 11,550, and that for the purpose of winding up his office. He states also that it is necessary to keep this office for another period of six months for winding it up. I submit, Sir, that it is absolutely unnecessary to keep it for another six months for the purpose of winding it up. But I shall have no objection to one-sixth of that sum being granted, viz., Rs. 1,925. I may be permitted to say that it is absolutely unfair to the House that the hon. the Finance Member should now come and say that it will take six months for winding it up. In other words, he is asking the House to reconsider its own decision. The House has a dignity of its own to keep, and if it is to go back upon the resolution which it passed only two days ago, I submit it would be stultifying itself. Therefore, consistently with our self-respect and with the self-respect of the House, we should reject this demand.

" With reference to the sum of Rs. 1,925, that is one-sixth of Rs. 11,550, and with reference to items 2 and 3, i.e., grant for Commercial Accountant and grant for Publicity Officer, I do not see any objection, and they may be given."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I am very much flattered by the Finance Member referring to my metaphor about the garden and the

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [29th March 1923]

gardener. He used it in his speech when this grant was originally cut off, and after hearing the usefulness of having a gardener to water the trees that are likely to bear fruit, we thought that the cost of gathering the fruits would be higher than the value of the fruits themselves and that it was better that the trees should be cut away at once. That point was fully discussed last time and a decision was arrived at. As for the difference in figures, they want now Rs. 2,000 per month for six months, whereas the original allotment was Rs. 1,000 last month. Their reason is that they want additional establishment before winding up the office. The Government do not seem to be dealing with the House fairly in asking for this grant.

"Now, so far as the Agency was concerned, this House came to the conclusion that a cut of five lakhs might be made; but the hon. the Finance Member says in his new memorandum that our arguments were inaccurate and misleading."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"May I rise to a personal explanation? The expression used was 'by certain inaccurate and misleading calculations'."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Calculations lead to arguments, Sir. Whatever it may be, we are once for all to go into the whole question and come to a conclusion whether it is right or wrong. I simply say that we discussed the whole question and came to the conclusion that this officer was unnecessary. I am afraid, Sir, when the new Council comes into being, the Government will ask for another six months for further winding up. The Government motion does not seem to be fair. Therefore, I appeal to the House to be consistent with their self-respect and vote against this grant by a larger majority than last time."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, I crave your indulgence for mentioning certain circumstances however much it may not ordinarily be allowable to mention them; for the Finance Committee requires also to be protected against any attacks that may be made on it. My friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, referred to the fact that the winding up of the office need not cost anything."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"What I said was that the Finance Member stated that it would take six months to wind it up. I said it certainly ought not to take six months."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"What I have understood as the object for asking for six months is to enable such inquiries as have been already initiated and which are in the process of completion. Otherwise, the labour and the money spent on such inquiries will be lost. Moreover, it has been said that with reference to the judicial establishments all over, there are some places where the clerks and other establishments are far more than necessary and in other places a little less. Therefore, we thought that to continue this inquiry and to make recommendations to the Retrenchment Committee, which is already sitting and looking into the matter, would be useful. It was, under these circumstances, that we were induced to permit the matter to be placed again before the House for its acceptance or rejection."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, Mr. President, I am a member of the Finance Committee, and I thank the Members here for having elected me to that Committee. We, the members of the Finance Committee, are guided by the materials placed before us, which I am sorry

29th March 1923]

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

are not available to the whole House. I request the Council to trust us and think that we are trying to do all that we can do in its interests. Sir, here was the Director of Office Systems, who, we were told, had given us a substantial saving. We were further told that it was expected that if he was allowed to continue for six months, he would show a substantial reduction. Under the circumstances, supposing we, the Finance Committee members, had refused to allow his continuance, the House would take us to task and say that we have not done our duty; they would say that if his services were continued for six months more, he would show us a great reduction of expenditure. Again, there is the Publicity Officer. He is in the middle of his work and he is getting orders and also advertisements for the Year Book. He has shown us that he has earned for us, after giving 500 copies free, an amount almost treble his pay. With these words, I request the House to trust us."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, as a member of the Finance Committee, I should also like to associate myself with what has been said by my hon. friend, Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar. From the materials that had been placed before us, we came to the conclusion that it would be more economical to give the Director of Office Systems a lease of another six months, because he was in the midst of very useful inquiries after the completion of which there would be a reduction in the expenditure of the Government. Therefore, Sir, we thought that, in spite of the fact that the House had voted against the appointment, it might reconsider its decision in view of the new materials that were placed before the Finance Committee."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I am raising a point of order. The hon. Member is referring to what took place in the Finance Committee and not merely to some conclusions."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I thought the hon. Member was referring to what they decided."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"He refers to what was placed before them."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The proceedings of the Finance Committee have not yet been placed before the House. The major ruling I gave was that they should not at all be referred to for any purpose. It has been referred to by the hon. the Finance Member, and I could allow it."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I would like that the question is reconsidered, because a number of useful inquiries will have to be made, and in the interests of retrenchment we should continue the Director of Office Systems for six months more. I therefore strongly appeal to the House to reconsider their decision in view of the fact that three members of the Committee have already expressed their opinion in favour of the continuance of the office for six months more."

Mr. C. E. WOOD:—"Mr. President, I rise to oppose the motion. I do not know the officer who has been holding the appointment which it is now proposed to abolish. I do not know whether the previous decision of the House to do away with this officer would lead to further economy in expenditure. The post deserves to be continued in view of the fact that economies to the extent of one lakh of rupees have already been effected. It seems to me, Sir, that in considering the question of the abolition of the post we

[Mr. C. E. Wood]

[29th March 1923]

should take into consideration the economies that he would be able to effect in future. It is the usual procedure in Government and other offices, when changes in the system are required and when economies are sought to be effected, that a man with a special knowledge is posted to look after the work. Any official can express any opinion upon a system himself, but it requires some expert authority to tell us which is the correct system. This officer has been appointed to a duty which requires an amount of study and experience; and we are told that certain plans have been made for further improvements. It will be absolute waste of money if these plans are not allowed to mature. In my opinion, it will take six months for this officer to complete his labours. If hon. Members say that further economies need not be effected or that the previous plans will be of no avail at all, then there will be some justification for supporting this motion. I strongly recommend, Sir, that this place be kept open for a further period of six months, though it cannot be retained permanently as it seems to me it should."

MR. A. M. MACDOUGALL:—"I feel more in the Council to-day what I felt three years ago when out of it, because the proceedings remind me very much of an annual general meeting of a firm where the directors are taken to task by the various shareholders for not caring for economy. When this Madras Government fell on evil days and required to retrench, they could be likened to a very large firm with hundreds of branches and the first thing that struck them was that it was necessary to retrench, and that with a vast number of branches there was every possibility of a great deal of leakage taking place. The Government very wisely appointed an official to examine the various office systems, and, if possible, economize in several other things and so save money. The record of that official, as the Council is aware, is a very good one. We do not require Government papers to see what economies have been effected. A number of Government officers occupying bungalows, paying huge rents, have been brought down into Government buildings, and that is only one item. The Director of Office Systems has gone so far, but he would go further still. He is more or less in the position of the liquidator of a firm who is trying to save it as much as possible giving the shareholders as great a return out of the assets left as he possibly can. Those who are in the Council can be said to be in the position of angry shareholders who for some particular purpose are wishing to cut down the liquidator's action shortly and say: 'Cut him off, one minute, let things go ahead.' As the office has been in existence for 12 months and no one ever knew in this Council that it would be cut off, no provision has been made to carry out the Director's projects. There are bound to be many of them on the table that still require his careful investigation, and if you cut him off, as has been suggested, to-morrow night and leave the things on the table to take care of themselves, where will the poor shareholders be? I think that is not the wish of the House, and I very strongly support the hon. the Finance Member."

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Mr. President, I am sorry that my hon. friend, Mr. Pakkiriswami Pillai, characterized the members of the Finance Committee as being agreeable to the Finance Member. I should say, Sir, that what duties are considered agreeable by my hon. friend might be disagreeable to the Finance Member. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar has said that the Director of Office Systems has before him certain enquiries which it will take

29th March 1923]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

sometime before he can complete, and I think that it is but right that he should be allowed to continue these things so that the Government may have the full benefit of the economies that he can effect. Moreover, I know there are a number of people in the House who feel that they have committed a fault in having cut off the item. If they are coming to the conclusion that they have actually committed a fault, I think they would prove themselves great by acknowledging their fault. I think, Sir, it is really a sign of greatness to accept a fault. No doubt, it is more than human to recognize that we have committed a fault, but, I think, by doing so we shall be showing not only to the country at large but also to the Government that we are willing to recognize that we have committed a fault and to go back on our decision."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I rise to support the motion of my hon. friend, Mr. Pakkiriswami Pillai, for a reduction of this grant, making provision for the contingent establishment for a month. We are somewhat handicapped in the decision of this question owing to the attitude taken by some of the members of the Finance Committee. The hon. the Finance Member himself told us in the beginning that he accepted the decision of the House and that he required a period of five months for practically finishing up the work taken up by him. It is in the light of that statement that you, Sir, were pleased to give the ruling that he was not out of order in raising the question. But the discussion that has subsequently taken place and the statements made by certain members of the Finance Committee have suggested a reconsideration of the decision of this House, and not for a provision being made for the winding up of the business of the Director of Office Systems."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I ask what the hon. Member is referring to? I have not heard any speech asking for an extension for more than six months."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, the speech of Dr. Subbarayan suggests no other inference. He even stated that though it was more than human to accept that one had committed an error, it was open to the Council if it felt that it had committed an error to correct itself. I can also point to the remarks of Mr. Usman Sahib, which were intended or calculated to support the same view. The speech of Mr. MacDougall left the same impression. While the hon. the Finance Member was not suggesting a reconsideration of the question, the discussion which has so far taken place has shown a desire on the part of some hon. Members, especially those who have the privilege to be in the Finance Committee, to suggest a reconsideration of the question. That point, Sir, is covered by the ruling already given that it is not open to the House in the first instance to reconsider the decision. That is the first point that I wish to refer.

"The second point that I wish to bring to the notice of the House is that there is absolutely no ground for suggesting that the decision was wrong and that on the merits it deserves reconsideration. Before we proceed further, may I draw the attention of this House to the fact that even in the explanatory note presented by the hon. the Finance Member there is no specific suggestion that this provision is required for the purpose of definitely winding up? I shall read the note—

The vote of the Council cancelling the whole of the allotment on account of the Director of Office Systems and his establishment is one which it is not practicable to give effect to since

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [29th March 1923]

the staff have earned their pay for the month of March, which forms part of the allotment which has been cut out. A supplementary grant is therefore inevitable. In proposing it, the Government have thought it well to ask for a half-year's provision or Rs. 11,550 in order to provide, in addition to the pay for March, for continuance of the staff for a period sufficient to enable the schemes in progress in connexion with the retrenchment question to be completed. This seems to be desirable in the interests of economy, and in view of the circumstances under which the vote was taken, the Government consider that it is likely that the Council will be prepared to accept the proposal.

"By eliminating the provision for the Director of Office Systems, the House should not be under the impression that it is not willing to have the retrenchment proposals completed. There has been a Retrenchment Committee and a Retrenchment Secretary who are still working in that direction. If the Government should consider that their efforts are to be made in that direction the Council will be quite willing to consider any proposals, but to state that this office is necessary for the purpose of carrying out retrenchment proposals is neither fair nor just."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I rise to make a personal explanation, Sir? The hon. Member says that the provision asked for is not for winding up the business. I can see no distinction between 'winding up a scheme' and 'carrying a scheme through to completion'. I have not asked for anything more than what you, Sir, were pleased to rule was in order."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I am not questioning the ruling given, Sir. But I should point out that there is a difference between taking steps merely for the purpose of winding up the business and taking steps for the purpose of carrying on the work sometime longer."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I ask the hon. gentleman to quote me correctly?"

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"There is no question of quoting or misquoting my hon. friend, Sir. I am putting my own interpretation on the passage that I just read from the explanatory note of the hon. Member. Not that I wanted to paraphrase it, but I am putting my own construction on it."

"Sir, having said that, I would appeal to this House not to be carried away, with due respects to the members of the Finance Committee, by the suggestion that we have to reconsider the proposal. I have great respect for the members of the Finance Committee and I may assure my hon. friend, Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar, that we have every confidence in them. But, Sir, if we cannot permit either the Government or the hon. the Finance Member to ask us to reconsider the question, we will be stultifying ourselves if we permit our own members in the Finance Committee to reconsider the question. If we are agreed that there is no room for reconsidering the question, our duty is to accept the motion which suggests that provision for a month be retained."

Mr. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—"Sir, the members of the Finance Committee say that with the materials placed before them they could not arrive at a better conclusion than what they have. My belief is that all the materials required for sanction have been placed before the Committee, for the Committee would not have passed it if it were otherwise. This officer seems to have served in some other department and has recently retired. When he is found to be of little use in one department because of his

29th March 1923] [Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai]

age-bar, he cannot be of any use in this new office. As my hon. friend, Mr. Arumainathan, has said, public servants were efficient even before the Director of Office Systems came into existence, and I think the dignity and self-respect of this House demand that we should not reconsider the decision."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Mr. President, may I say at the outset that the very last thing that I had in my mind in moving this motion was to do anything in any way to affront the dignity or self-respect of this Council? I was very careful to say that we entirely intended loyally to carry out the conclusion the Council arrived at, namely, that this office should come to an end. But as Mr. MacDougall has said, you cannot suddenly and without warning wind up an enquiry within 48 hours, and not lose money in the process. The hon. mover's method of securing economy and maintaining the dignity of the Council was, so far as I could understand him, to replace this officer by a Director of Communal Representation, to which he added the further recommendation, if I understood him correctly, that the Council should elect the five or six most disagreeable gentlemen they can find to sit with the Finance Member and make his life a burden to him.

" Well, Sir, I do not think that these proposals will appeal to the Council
12-15 p.m. as either dignified or business-like. He has said that the members of the Finance Committee are very agreeable to the Finance Member. I acknowledge, with the greatest possible gratitude, that our relations have been of the very best. But when I say that the Committee are very agreeable, that is altogether a different thing from saying that they are very pliable, or that they give way to the Finance Member every time. I do not wish to refer to the discussions as to what took place in the Finance Committee, but I do wish to lay stress on one point. The Finance Committee are the people who study every proposal for expenditure that comes up. The Finance Committee have held over 50 meetings this year, going into matters in detail, and as a result the Finance Committee are the people who know. That is the reason why the Finance Committee are people whose opinions should be given some consideration. There is hardly a member of the Finance Committee here who has not come forward now to assure the Council that the result of the study of the subject by him is that this officer is saving Government money."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" If the hon. Member refers only to those members who have spoken, I have nothing to say. But if he means that all the members of the Finance Committee are of that opinion, I have to disagree with him. In fact, I am going to vote against this demand being granted."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I said, Sir, that the Finance Committee consist of the people who know. Do I understand that my hon. friend wishes me to make him an exception to that statement? "

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Knowing does not always mean agreeing. It may also mean disagreeing with any particular matter."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Well, Sir, some reference has been made to the question of winding up. What we asked for in the note was time for the completion of the enquiries that are now in progress. But, as Mr. Tanikachala Chettiayar has very clearly put it, the winding up of an

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[29th March 1923]

enquiry is different from the winding up of an office. Even the winding up of an office is not a matter to be done in 48 hours, if the papers are to be left in a state in which other officers can take them over and handle them. The officer in charge should be given at least a fortnight's time to sort the papers, and the Government should be given some little time to find out to whom they are to transfer the enquiries and to allow time for the officer conducting the enquiries to pass them on to the people who are to conduct them in the future; so that this one-month proposal would be exceedingly hard both on the officer and on the Government, because it would mean that the officer must go on Saturday night, the interval being composed of holidays, and leave his papers exactly as they are at the present moment. What, however, we have asked for is time, not only to wind up the office, but also to complete enquiries which are in progress and not to undertake anything new.

"I quite see Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar's point about the new expenditure and will only say with regard to it that it was merely for the sake of simplicity and following the motion which was tabled by Mr. Muniswami Nayudu on the last occasion that I took exactly one-half of the figure first asked for. The sum in issue is not large, but I could, of course, cut off a small amount on account of the inspectors of stationery if that was desired.

"Then, Sir, it has been stated that we are asking the House to reconsider by coming forward with fresh grants and that really this is an endeavour to keep the officer on right through the year. I venture to repudiate that statement. The office cannot be continued without a supplementary grant. Nobody can come forward for a supplementary grant except the Government, and I have given the House an assurance that the Government are not going to do so.

"It is also suggested that the crop of these fruit trees is not going to be worth the wages. I have offered to the House a balance sheet to show that they have been covered many times over, and I promise them that the very moment the office ceases to pay, the wages will cease. We only want to carry through the enquiries which are now in hand, and I can assure the House that every one of them will end in much economy to Government."

A poll was taken on the motion with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 19. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 20. " C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 3. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 21. Mr. T. Siva Rao. |
| 4. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 22. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 5. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 23. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam |
| 6. " W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | Nayudu. |
| 7. " J. Kuppuswami. | 24. Mr. M. Suryanarayana. |
| 8. " B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 25. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha Chariu |
| 9. " A. P. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 26. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 10. " V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 27. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 11. " P. T. Rajan. | 28. " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 12. " W. P. A. Sundarapandiya Nadar. | 29. " T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 13. " R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. | 30. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 14. " T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 31. " T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 15. " A. Subbarayadu. | 32. Sri M. V. Apparao Bahadur. |
| 16. " V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 33. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampin. |
| 17. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao | 34. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| Pantulu. | |
| 18. " L. A. Govindaraghava | |
| Ayyar. | |

29th March 1923]

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 19. Dr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 20. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 3. " the Raja of Panagal. | 21. " P. Kesava Pillai. |
| 4. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu. | 22. " Sir P. Desika Achariyar. |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 23. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 24. Muhammad Abdur-Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. " Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 25. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 8. Mr. E. S. Lloyd. | 26. Haji Abdulla Sahib Bahadur. |
| 9. " A. Y. G. Campbell. | 27. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 10. " C. Madhavan Nayar. | 28. Rao Bahadur M. C. Madurai Pillai. |
| 11. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai. | 29. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 12. Mr. E. F. Thomas. | 30. Mr. A. M. MacDougall. |
| 13. " E. Periyarayagam. | 31. Rao Sahib Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chettiyar. |
| 14. " A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 32. Rao Bahadur T. Numberumal Chettiyar. |
| 15. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ehirajulu Nayudu. | 33. Mr. C. E. Wood. |
| 16. " O. Tanickachala Chettiyar. | |
| 17. " O. Natesa Mudaliyar. | |
| 18. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. | |

The motion was carried, 34 voting *for* and 33 *against* it.

The demand *minus* the reduction was then put and the grant was made.

DEMAND XL. POLICE.

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, I move *for a grant not exceeding Rs. 25,000 under Demand XL. Police.*

"I hope this will be a non-controversial matter. The provision for Plague Police had to be taken away owing to the decision of the House on a previous occasion. But 21 local bodies now require this to be restored as they feel that this provision is necessary for the purpose of guarding the evacuated houses. The memorandum explains itself."

The demand was put to the Council and passed. The grant was made

DEMAND XLI. EDUCATION—NON-EUROPEAN.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I beg to move *for a grant not exceeding Rs. 23,000 in addition to Grant XVII already sanctioned by this House. The reasons for this demand are explained in the memorandum.*"

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,000 for Education (Non-European) by Rs. 100.

Mr. President, the object with which I have given notice of this motion is to say that we are not satisfied with the reasons that are given in the memorandum. The House will remember well that all the reasons (1) to (9) were mentioned by the hon. the Minister when he moved sometime ago for a recurring grant of Rs. 65,000 for the University. The House will also remember that before the vote of the House was taken, he said that he was going to utilize the amount on every one of those items. Then, the question was raised whether it was a lump sum grant or whether there were details. I believe it is within the recollection of this House that every one of these details was given as the details that were before the Minister, and he said

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [29th March 1923]

that those were the various objects required to be carried out by the University from time to time. With those objects, the demand was then placed before the House. But I am not able to understand why an additional sum of Rs. 23,000 is required now at this stage. Is it a case of miscalculation or wrong calculation, or has the University subsequently asked the Minister to find some more money for these very objects? Of course, some of us coming from the mufassal will always view additional grants for the metropolis with great jealousy and will require greater explanation. At least, it will be politic on our part to demand for more details and scrutinise all the grants for expenditure on the metropolis."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, after the grant was passed by the House at the time of the budget, certain items were
12-30 p.m. again brought up, and we found that larger sums were needed under all these items. Therefore the probable amount is put in and a demand therefor has been made."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"Sir, if the hon. the Minister expected that this House should give an intelligent vote upon this question, I think it was his duty to have taken us a little more into his confidence and told us what exactly the requirements of these various Chairs were and of the studentships that he mentioned as the items with respect to which this additional amount was required. The House will remember that it is practically a recurring grant that we are now asked to vote for in this supplementary grant. As my hon. friend, Mr. Narasimharaju, has pointed out, the requirements on account of these various items which are specified in this Demand might have been present to the hon. Member's mind at the time when the original vote was taken and given. Now we are in the dark altogether as to what exactly the various sums are that are required, and it may be that the House is of opinion with respect to particular items or all of them, that more expenditure has been proposed to be incurred than is necessary. The House may be of opinion that in the case of some of these Chairs the amounts that are promised to their possible incumbents are far too low to attract the right quality of men. In these circumstances, it appears to me that before the hon. Member can expect the House to vote for this item it is necessary for him to tell us exactly what the various details of the proposed expenditure are on account of these items; and in doing so, I take it that I am not asking Members of Government to do anything more than what is being done in the budget estimate of expenditure. If hon. Members will look into it they will find that not only the amounts, but also the various details thereof are given therein. But now we are asked to vote for a supplementary grant without being informed of what the exact amounts are that are expected to be required for the purpose of meeting these various items of expenditure. I believe the hon. Member himself will grant that my request is a perfectly reasonable one. I am perfectly in sympathy with the activities of the University being begun early and on a large scale and being made effective. But before we are sure that we are spending money for a good purpose and in the right direction, the House has to be told what exactly the amounts are that are required for these various items coming under heads 1 to 9, beginning with the Chair for Experimental Psychology, and ending with two studentships in Philology and Study of Languages and Literature according to modern critical methods."

29th March 1923]

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" I have nothing to reply, Sir, except stating that I am not satisfied with the necessity for the supplementary grant."

The motion of Mr. Narasimha Raju for reduction of the grant by Rs. 100 was put to the House and negatived.

The Further Demand No. XLI. Education — Non-European—for Rs. 23,000, was then put to the House and carried ; and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLII—LABOUR INCLUDING FACTORIES.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" Sir, having regard to the observations that fell from you earlier in the day in regard to the point of order, I do not move 'Further Demand No. XLII' for a grant not exceeding 10,220 for Factories "

DEMAND XLIII. CIVIL WORKS (TRANSFERRED).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 9,500, under Demand No. XLIII. Civil Works (Transferred). The explanation in connexion with this demand is given in the printed memorandum circulated to all hon. Members."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLV. IRRIGATION—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS.

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, it will be noticed that this demand relates to schemes for capital expenditure in regard to Irrigation. The explanation given in the printed memorandum is perfectly clear, but I may add that there is a further project which will be put into operation, namely, the Kistna Ancient Shutters scheme which has not been included here because I expected to move for a supplementary grant for it later on when the necessity arose. I move for the grant not exceeding Rs. 1,76,000 under Demand No. XLV. Irrigation—Public Works Officers."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLVI. LOANS AND ADVANCES BY THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Mr. President, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 8,00,000, under Demand No. XLVI Loans and Advances by the Provincial Government for expenditure on Debt Heads. The sum is to be divided between the Port Conservancy Board, Tuticorin, which wants a sum of Rs. 3,00,000 for the Tuticorin Harbour, and the Madras Corporation, which wants Rs. 5,00,000 for the Mambalam Town-Planning Scheme. As I explained in opening these further demands for grants, these are two items of expenditure to be incurred out of Loan Funds, the amount which we have available from these funds having increased owing to the reduction in the deficit in the Budget. We had a total sum of 125 lakhs of rupees which we completely used up in the first instance. But now that we have got reduction in the deficit, we have included these two most urgent schemes which would together cost 8 lakhs."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Sir, I move that the allotment of Rs. 8,00,000 for Loans and Advances by the Provincial Government be reduced by Rs. 100.

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [29th March 1923]

"Sir, the object with which I gave notice of this motion for reduction is to have information from the Government as to how the various local authorities are being treated in the matter of their loan applications. I believe Government have not got any definite policy in the matter of giving loans to local bodies, and I believe the Madras Corporation is treated with greater leniency than the local bodies. If the hon. the Finance Member will place before us information as to the applications that have been received from the various local bodies, how they are being dealt with, what amounts are being lent to various local bodies, and what proportion of the whole amount that is being lent to local bodies is being given to the Madras Corporation, the House will be in a better position to accept or reject this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Mr. President, the hon. Member has moved a reduction of Rs. 100 out of two specific loans, and I have given information relating to them. But if he is going to ask me for figures which would involve a very considerable amount of preparation and calculation, I am sorry I cannot reel out on the spur of the moment all the figures he has asked for."

Diwan Bahadur T. N. SIVAGNANAM PILLAI:—"Sir, it is said that the scheme is pending final consideration. I wish to know whether it would be in order if we give a loan of 3 lakhs when the scheme itself is not finally settled. I want information on that point from the hon. the Finance Member, Sir."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I explain, Sir, to the hon. Member that there is difference between a budget estimate and a specific sanction. This is only a proposal to put the amount in the budget estimate and to obtain the approval of the Council to our granting this loan if and when the time comes for giving a specific sanction after the completion of the necessary inquiry. The state of the matter is this. After a series of inquiries, a scheme has been arrived at, which has commended itself to the local Port authorities and the local Chamber of Commerce, whose meetings have just been held and a large volume of papers containing their conclusions and various suggestions is in circulation. As soon as the Government deal with that matter specific sanction will be given, if the Government approve of the scheme. If they do not approve the scheme, specific sanction will not be given and the loan will not be made."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I want just to say a few words in support of this demand. The harbour question was engaging the attention of the Government for a number of years and a special committee was appointed to go into the question of harbours. Leaving Vizagapatam alone which was considered as a separate scheme, Tuticorin was recommended as one of the best places to be adopted on the East Coast, and another place the name of which I just now forget on the West Coast. The harbour at Tuticorin has also been recommended by the Chamber of Commerce and the proposed further grant is necessary for this purpose.

"The second thing is the Mambalam scheme, and for the last two or three years this matter has been engaging the attention of the Town Planning Trust, but nothing has been done so far in order to give facilities for house-builders. The Corporation has come forward to take 600 acres of the land in the Mambalam scheme, and in order to enable it to finance the scheme,

29th March 1923] [Mr. T. Namberumal Chettiyar]

it has applied for this loan. Under these circumstances, I trust the House will not raise any objection against this grant."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, with reference to the remark made by the hon. the Finance Member I should like to say that it is certainly not the object of my hon. friend who brought forward this motion to ask for exact figures as to the applications made by local bodies for loans. But the fact remains that there are very large numbers of applications, and I myself as also other hon. Members have received communications from the local bodies with which we are connected and in which we are interested for the purpose of financing many schemes of water-supply, drainage, etc. But the hon. the Finance Member says that he cannot give that information. Certainly, he is aware of the fact that these large numbers of applications are pending, and I think they have been turned down for some reason or another. I expect the hon. Minister in charge of Local Self-Government to give us some information whether it is so or not. As a matter of fact, I understand that a large number of applications have come to the Secretariat for loan. We are certainly entitled to know what has become of these applications, in what stage they are, how they have been dealt with, and so on. We see that the Madras Corporation and the Port Trust are picked out for being preferentially treated. We have been continuously protesting and urging in this House that though expenditure may undoubtedly be necessary for the metropolis, there are limitations even to this expenditure. We have a scheme connected with the improvement of the Coom for about Rs. 14,00,000, and we do not know where we will be in making all these commitments. In Madras we have a University which is going to take up a considerable amount of money from this province, and considerable amounts are spent for Madras and its suburbs. I do not know what the conception of my hon. friend is as to what the Government should do for the rest of the province. I think it is for my hon. friend to say whether our complaint is justified or not."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Sir, my hon. friends seem to be jealous of the treatment that is accorded to the Corporation of Madras. The application for a loan by the Madras Corporation is in connexion with a scheme which is at once useful and profitable. It is expected that the Corporation will be able to repay the loan in the course of a couple of years.

"I know, Sir, that there are some applications from some mufassal municipalities and district boards for loans. But in most of these cases the difficulty is that the local bodies are not in a position to finance the schemes for which loans are required. If local bodies are in a position to place before the House schemes which they can finance, the Government will be glad to help them by advancing loans."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" I must confess that I am not satisfied with what the hon. the Chief Minister has said. He says that the scheme for the Madras Town Extension is ready and it will be paid for. He also says that the mufassal local bodies are not able to finance their schemes. I am at a loss to understand why he should say that the local bodies could not finance their schemes. We all know that the Government have adopted a loan policy. The important question to be considered is whether any local body which has made an application for loan is not in a

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [29th March 1923]

position to repay or has not got the financial stability to justify the Government to advance loans. I do not think that the hon. Minister asserts that none of the local bodies which have made applications for loans have the financial stability necessary to justify the Government to advance moneys to them. If that be the case it is an extraordinary proposition, and it requires a very careful examination at the hands of the hon. the Minister and the hon. the Finance Member. If such a statement were allowed to come forward from the Government without being challenged, it will create a very great consternation in the country."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, my hon. friends, Mr. Narasimha Raju and Mr. Ramachandra Rao, have raised the question why the Madras Corporation should get a loan. May I remind them that both of them were members of the Council which enacted the Madras Town-Planning Act? If the Act for the passing of which both the hon. Members were instrumental has to be worked out, the Madras Corporation needs the help of the Government. In pursuance of the provisions of the Act, a committee has been appointed by the Government to work out the details and their labours have proceeded far and long. They have devised some schemes for the expansion of the city of Madras which will add to the convenience and comforts of both the hon. Members among others whose presence in this House has added to the requirements of the city. The object of this loan is to enable the Corporation to provide by acquiring the adjacent lands sufficient accommodation and comfortable quarters for the residents of the city and thus increase the amenities not merely of its citizens but of other gentlemen who come here occasionally to contribute to its congestion. The Corporation offers to repay the loan not within a period of thirty years as some other local bodies do, but within a period of two years. From a business point of view, it is better to advance a loan to a person who offers to pay it back within two years rather than to one who offers to repay it within thirty years. Under these circumstances, I hope my hon. friends will not be unduly severe upon the Madras Corporation which is after all trying to provide for the convenience of the residents of the city."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, with reference to what my hon. friend, Mr. Narasimha Raju, said about the consternation that will be created by reason of the hon. the Minister's announcement, I wish to explain a little further the policy of the Government in respect to loans to local bodies. Roughly speaking, we have two classes of loans. The first consists of loans for water-supply and drainage works which have already been referred to. The usual policy with these loans is what is generally known as the half loan and half grant policy. The local body comes up and asks the Government to assist in a scheme and the Government gives a grant of half and offers to lend the other half of the sum that is required to carry out the scheme. It is necessary that the local body should show that it can find the service of a loan of its own half. I do not know whether there are any schemes on their way through the office in which the local bodies have shown that they can find their own half of the amount required. I have seen several schemes lately in which the difficulty was that the local bodies could not find the service of the loan for their half of the cost of the work.

"The other case is where a local body wishes to embark upon capital expenditure. In the case of this sort we examine the normal revenue and

29th Marh 1923]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

the normal expenditure of the local body and see whether there is sufficient balance of normal revenue over normal expenditure to supply the service of the loan. Recently we have had one or two cases in which we have not had that normal balance. I do not know whether there are other cases on their way in which a normal balance can be found; but I am not aware of any large number of cases pending or awaiting disposal in the Government office."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The demand was put and passed and the grant was made.

IV

THE MADRAS HINDU RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS BILL, 1922—*cont.*

Clause 22.

Sub-clause (1).

(Amendment No. 116.)

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I beg to move—

In item (b) (iv) between the words 'trustee' and 'of' insert the words 'or servant'.

"Sir, this clause relates to the disqualification of candidates and members of the committee. One of the disqualifications mentioned in item (iv) of this sub-clause (b) is being a trustee of a temple over which the committee has jurisdiction.

"What I wish to add is that the servant of a temple over which the committee has jurisdiction should not also be qualified to become a committee member. It is obvious that being a servant of the temple, he should be in a subordinate position and should not assume the role of a *committeedar* who has got the right of general superintendence over the temple and who has also got some control over the trustee under whom as a servant he is expected to serve. Under these circumstances, I think that a servant of the temple ought also to be disqualified from being a *committeedar*."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"Sir, I am in entire sympathy with the object of my hon. friend's amendment. But the difficulty is that a servant may be either a salaried servant or a mirasi servant. I do not know whether my hon. friend wants the exclusion of merely salaried servants or mirasi servants also. If he makes his position clear, I will be able to tell him what the Government proposes to do in this connexion."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I am glad that the hon. the Minister has somewhat cleared the position. I mean only a salaried servant and not a mirasi servant."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"If that is his object, I think the hon. Member might withdraw his amendment and allow me to move an amendment in less ambiguous language."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

(Amendment No. 117.)

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"Sir, I beg to move.

In item (b) (iv) between the words 'trustee' and 'of' insert the words 'or salaried servant'."

The amendment was put and carried.